

1 BRIAN M. BOYNTON  
Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General  
2 Civil Division  
JAMES G. TOUHEY, JR.  
3 Director, Torts Branch  
PHILIP D. MACWILLIAMS  
4 D.C. Bar No. 482883  
5 Trial Attorney  
IRINA M. MAJUMDAR  
6 D.C. Bar No. 252757  
7 Trial Attorney  
E-mail: phil.macwilliams@usdoj.gov  
8 U.S. Department of Justice  
9 Civil Division, Torts Branch  
Benjamin Franklin Station, P.O. Box 888  
10 Washington, DC 20044  
11 Telephone: (202) 616-4285  
Facsimile: (202) 616-5200  
12 Attorneys for the United States of America

13  
14 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
15 FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA

16 C.M., on her own behalf and on behalf of  
17 her minor child, B.M.; L.G., on her own  
behalf and on behalf of her minor child,  
18 B.G.; M.R., on her own behalf and on  
behalf of her minor child, J.R.; O.A., on her  
19 own behalf and on behalf of her minor  
20 child, L.A.; and V.C., on her own behalf  
and on behalf of her minor child, G.A.,  
21

22 Plaintiffs,

23 v.

24 United States of America,

25 Defendant.  
26  
27  
28

No. 2:19-CV-05217-SRB

**UNITED STATES' RESPONSE TO  
THE COURT'S ORDER DATED  
FEBRUARY 15, 2022 (ECF 137)**

1 On February 15, 2022, the Court issued an order granting in part and denying in part  
2 Plaintiffs' motion to compel discovery withheld by the Government based on privilege.  
3 *CM* ECF 137; *APF* ECF 136.

4 In Part I of the order, the Court listed the documents it found were properly  
5 redacted to protect attorney-client and/or work product privilege. *CM* ECF 137 at 2-4;  
6 *APF* ECF 136 at 2-4.

7 In Part II of the order, the Court listed the documents it found were redacted and  
8 not privileged. *CM* ECF 137 at 4-5; *APF* ECF 136 at 4-5. The United States has produced  
9 those documents to Plaintiffs un-redacted in accordance with the Court's order.

10 In Part III of the order, the Court addressed an email thread relating to an editorial  
11 in *USA Today* dated May 30, 2018. The Court ordered the United States to re-review the  
12 *USA Today* editorial-related email strings, and produce a final version that has no  
13 redactions for emails inconsistently previously redacted and to leave redacted only those  
14 portions of emails that are clearly legal analysis and not advice about how best to respond  
15 to the editorial or to the public relations issues the editorial created. *CM* ECF 137 at 6;  
16 *APF* ECF 136 at 6. The United States has produced these documents to Plaintiffs with  
17 revised (and, for some emails in the thread, completely removed) redactions, in  
18 accordance with this Court's order.

19 Also in Part III of the order, the Court ordered the United States to respond to four  
20 questions from the Court relating to a document titled, "DHS Response to DOJ Analysis  
21 of Litigation Risk Associated with Draft MOA between ORR and DHS." *CM* ECF 137 at  
22 5-6; *APF* ECF 136 at 5-6. The United States provides the following responses:

23 First, the MOA referenced in this document was finalized by the Department of  
24 Homeland Security (DHS) and the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS), and  
25 was produced to Plaintiffs. A copy will be provided to the Court for further context, to  
26 assist the Court in its analysis of whether the "DHS Response to DOJ Analysis of  
27 Litigation Risk Associated with Draft MOA between ORR and DHS" (hereinafter "DHS  
28 Response") is privileged. As for the "DHS Response" itself, to the best of the  
government's knowledge following a search of the documents, all copies of this document

1 produced to Plaintiffs had the “Draft” imprint and the header stating “ATTORNEY  
2 WORK PRODUCT/ATTORNEY-CLIENT PRIVILEGED COMMUNICATION/PRE-  
3 DECISIONAL DRAFT”. No version without these markings has been located.

4 Second, both the attorney-client privilege and work product doctrine are claimed  
5 for the DHS Response. The DOJ’s risk analysis referenced therein (and further discussed  
6 below) was addressed to DHS and HHS, and the DHS Response appears to have been sent  
7 to DOJ for further discussion. A copy of the parent email, which was not redacted for  
8 privilege and was not included with the DHS Response when submitted to the Court for *in*  
9 *camera* review, will be provided to the Court for further context to assist in the Court’s  
10 analysis.

11 Third, the DOJ’s risk analysis has not been produced. However, it has been located  
12 and will be produced forthwith to Plaintiffs, subject to any applicable redactions for  
13 privilege. If the Court wishes to review this document *in camera* to assist in its analysis,  
14 the United States will promptly submit a copy to the Court.

15 Fourth, the claim for the work product doctrine is on behalf of both DOJ and DHS.  
16 Because the document was created by DHS attorneys and contains those attorneys’ legal  
17 analysis of potential litigation risk associated with entering into a memorandum of  
18 agreement with HHS’s Office of Refugee Resettlement (“ORR”), the document contains  
19 DHS’s work product. Additionally, the document also contains DOJ’s work product  
20 because it both references and directly quotes from DOJ’s “Analysis of Litigation Risk  
21 Associated with the Draft Memorandum of Agreement Between the Office of Refugee  
22 Resettlement and the Department of Homeland Security,” which was created by DOJ  
23 attorneys to assess potential litigation risk associated with the proposed memorandum of  
24 agreement.

25 Submitted this 25th day of February, 2022.

26 BRIAN M. BOYNTON  
27 Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General  
28 Civil Division  
JAMES G. TOUHEY, JR.

Director, Torts Branch

*s/ Phil MacWilliams*

PHILIP D. MACWILLIAMS

Trial Attorney

D.C. Bar No. 482883

IRINA M. MAJUMDAR

Trial Attorney

D.C. Bar No. 252757

E-mail: phil.macwilliams@usdoj.gov

U.S. Department of Justice

Civil Division, Torts Branch

Benjamin Franklin Station, P.O. Box 888

Washington, DC 20044

Telephone: (202) 616-4285

Attorneys for the United States of America

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on February 25, 2022, I electronically transmitted the attached document to the Clerk's Office using the CM/ECF System for filing and transmittal of a Notice of Electronic Filing to all CM/ECF registrants.

*s/ Phil MacWilliams*

PHILIP D. MACWILLIAMS

Attorney for United States of America